DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 295 TM 033 721

AUTHOR Trenta, Louis; Newman, Isadore; Newman, Carole; Salzman, James; Lenigan, David; Newman, David

TITLE Evaluation of a Teacher Mentoring Program Using a Mixed Methods Approach.

PUB DATE 2002-02-28

NOTE 24p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (25th, Sarasota, FL, February 27-March 2, 2002).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Focus Groups; *Mentors; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Experience

IDENTIFIERS Mixed Method Evaluation; *Stakeholders

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on an evaluation of a unique 3-year program designed to support new teachers in a school district. The emphasis in the evaluation was on the participation of the multiple stakeholders in the evaluation process, which was endorsed by the teachers union, school district administrators, and entry-year teachers. The people who are the intended focus of the Teacher Evaluation Program (TEP) are referred to as interns. Interns are assisted by consulting teachers who are experienced teachers assigned to orient, help, and evaluate the interns. Consulting teachers receive specific guidelines and must complete reports at given times in the TEP process. The case study began with a six-person focus group to discuss the TEP program. A quantitative and qualitative questionnaire was developed and revised, and then sent to approximately 200 participants. Responses from all stakeholders supported the mentor-evaluation program. Some stakeholders were more positive than others, but everyone believed the program worked. There was a high degree of comfort in having the same consulting teacher serve in both mentor and evaluator roles. Participants thought that the TEP should not be applied to all participants in the same way; experienced teachers newly hired should not receive the same focus as novice teachers. Participants also objected to the amount of record keeping required. (Contains 15 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 295

EVALUATION OF A TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAM USING A MIXED METHODS APPROACH

By

Dr. Louis Trenta, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Carole Newman

The University of Akron

Dr. James Salzman, Cleveland State University,

David Lenigan, Berea City School District

David Newman, The University of Akron

A paper prepared for presentation at the

Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association

Sarasota, Florida, February 28, 2002

TM033721

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Trenta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF A TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAM USING A MIXED METHODS APPROACH

Dr. Louis Trenta, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Carole Newman

The University of Akron

Dr. James Salzman, Cleveland State University,

David Lenigan, Berea City School District

David Newman, The University of Akron

Objective

This paper reports on an evaluation of a unique 3-year program designed to support new teachers in a school district. The emphasis in the evaluation was on the participation of the multiple stakeholders in the evaluation process. The teachers union, school district administrators, and the entry year teachers jointly supported the program and endorsed this evaluation.

Theoretical Perspective

When the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation considered personnel evaluation, it made two observations of interest to school district leadership and, hopefully, the school community. First, it noted that it in order to educate students effectively, it is necessary for the institution to use evaluation to select, retain, and develop quality personnel (p. 5). Secondly, the Committee noted, "However, despite its centrality, educational institutions have often been ineffective in carrying out their personnel evaluation responsibilities" (p. 6). Bolman

and Deal reflect somewhat the same point when they write about the substantial time, effort, and money devoted to evaluating individuals and programs and note that the results of these evaluations typically disappear and yet by their existence serve the purpose of giving the institutional an image of good management (p. 244). Yet, they also make the point that evaluation, whether of individuals or a program, serves multiple purposes. It can at once serve to reward and control performance, help people grow, be an opportunity to exercise power, and provide an occasion for all to play roles in a shared ritual (p. 266).

In the current school reform, high stakes testing environment, the task before the district administrator and the evaluator is to overcome the ineffectiveness of evaluation—individual and program—and actually cause improvement. This means learning or adaptation must take place; the individuals being evaluated must learn and change behaviors and the institution must learn and change institutional culture. To bring this about it is necessary for evaluators to "recognize the arena in which evaluation operates, understand organizational dynamics, tailor their procedures and techniques to market the evaluation process effectively, and become one of the voices in the organization" (Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer, p. 536). Further, Preskill and Torres suggest that such individual and institutional (team) learning occurs when individuals participate in a collaborative evaluation process that is guided by dialogue and reflection (pp. 26 & 35). Heifetz seems to concur when he says. "The inclusion of competing value perspectives may be essential to adaptive success" (p. 23). Bridges and Groves in winding up their report on politics in personnel evaluation observed that their analysis suggested "that viewing personnel evaluation simply in rational, technical terms conceals more than it illuminates" (p. 335).

With this context in mind, the role of the evaluator must go beyond technical assistance. Working with the institutional stakeholders in a clinical manner, the evaluator and the

stakeholders together evolve a highly customized evaluation over time (Preskill & Torres, p. 29). Since, and perhaps in part due to, the Qualitative-Quantitative Paradigm Wars of 1980-1995, a greater openness to mixed methods in evaluation has occurred (Caracelli, p. 100-101). This openness to a variety of methods should facilitate bringing educators of all roles—administrative and classroom—together to approach evaluation as a means to promote dialogue, to enhance and make more professional satisfying the work of both teachers and administrators (Stronge & Tucker, p. 356). This would make all the more important the conceptualization of the role of today's evaluators by the application of "such terms as *facilitator, problem solver, educator, coach* and *critical friend*" (Caracelli, p. 103).

In their research on implementing a new teacher evaluation system, Davis, Pool, and Mits-Cash also found,

> Given what is known about change in educational organizations, it is clear that for a new teacher assessment system to continue to affect the lives of students and improve teaching and learning, continual up-dates, modifications, and revisions are in order. Especially as the systems move toward full implementation, it is imperative that district policy makers have as much feedback from the field as possible. This feedback should be frequent, accurate, and *derived from a variety of data collection methods* [emphasis added] (p. 304).

Thus, we accepted as a starting point that for an evaluation to be successful the participants have to be involved in its process. The stakeholders have to understand and value the information that can be derived from the evaluation, and they need to be willing to become collaborative partners in the undertaking. To accomplish that we took as a framework for this project the Personnel Involvement Evaluation Model (Newman, Deitchman, & Williams, 1978).

This model is a four-step process that requires engagement with key stakeholders in all stages. The four stages are:

1. Identify a sample of key stakeholders
2. Collaboratively develop the evaluation criteria/instrument
3. Member check for validity of criteria/instrument
4. Collaboratively analyze/interpret the data.

This study began with conversations between the district administrator who was responsible for the teacher mentoring-evaluation plan and the researcher. Those discussions and discussions with the District Review Board, which is responsible for supervising the implementation of the program, brought out the presence of the components of a well-designed induction program. Dagenais specifies the five characteristics of successful induction programs to be: (a) they provide a clear scope for the program, (b) they identify mentor selection and matching criteria, (c) they provide intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards for attracting and retaining mentors, (d) they provide mentor training, and (e) they evaluate the success of the program. The district's induction program had the first four characteristics clearly present. The fifth characteristic, evaluation of the program, was considered insufficient to generate program improvement and thus the researchers were approached to undertake this study.

Description of Program

The object of this evaluation was the a medium sized (8,000 students), mid-west, suburban school district's Teacher Evaluation Program (TEP) as it was implemented for beginning teachers, experienced teachers new to the district, and reassigned teachers as well as educational personnel such as librarians and counselors working under the educational personnel

certificate for the first time. The responsibility for implementation and administration of the TEP was been assigned to a District Review Board (DRB).

The people who are the intended focus of the TEP are referred to as interns in the program's documentation and this evaluation. A second role in the TEP is that of consulting teacher. Consulting teachers are experienced teachers assigned by the district to orient, help develop, and evaluate interns during their first three years of employment with the district. The consulting teachers are to provide feedback for development and to evaluate the interns as part of the re-employment decision-making process. For each intern there is a designated administrator who works with the consulting teacher by discussing the intern's development plan with the consulting teacher and by advising the consulting teacher of concerns related to the intern. The designated administrator deals directly with the intern on non-instructional matters such as attendance and district personnel procedures and indirectly through the consulting teacher on instruction related matters for the first year of intern participation. In the second and third years of participation the designated administrator and consulting teacher have equal responsibility for evaluation of instructional performance.

There are at least nine forms specified for use by the consulting teachers and administrators to provide official communications with the intern and the DRB. A consulting teacher is directed to spend between 20 and 36 hours with his/her intern in classroom observations and conferences during the intern's first year and 13 to 24 hours in the second and third years. A very specific timeline of activities and reports is given with specific actions to be carried out in September and October, November, between December 1 and February, in February, March, and May.

Stipends are provided to the consulting teachers to prepare program documents and meet with interns, administrators, and the DRB. Class coverage or release time is provided for the consulting teacher to do classroom observations and conferences.

Research Methods

As noted above, the case study began with conversations between the district administrator who was responsible for the teacher mentoring-evaluation plan, the DRB, and the researcher. The researcher developed key evaluation concepts from these conversations and used those concepts to stimulate discussions with a six person focus group composed of representatives from all stakeholder groups in the program (DRB, mentors/consulting teachers, and teachers who had recently been mentees/new hires). One of the evaluators took notes summarizing the essence of the discussions, checking their accuracy by paraphrasing them to the focus group members until the members agreed that the researcher had captured their views. The data was compiled and categorized by the evaluators, and the categories were checked with the district administrator.

There were four anticipated results from this stepped process. First, the evaluation designers, that is, both the outside evaluators and the district personnel, identified the issues that were meaningful and pertinent for the district at this time. Secondly, the evaluators learned about the issues from knowledgeable and motivated stakeholders. Thirdly, the stakeholders became sensitive to each other's views about the program and its components. Finally, the evaluators were able to gain consensus concerning the constructs and evaluation questions about data needed to be collected. The five essential evaluation questions were:

1. What is effective in this program as it is currently designed?
2. What is not effective in this program as it is currently designed?

3. Considering what is both effective and not effective, what *can* be improved in this program?
4. Considering what is both effective and not effective, what *should* be improved in this program?
5. How do perceptions of the various stakeholders match up with each other?

Based upon the questions, the conversations, with the district administrator, the evaluators' notes, and the categorized data from the focus group, the evaluators constructed five parallel questionnaires—one for each role group in the program. The initial survey was presented to the initial focus group for review and reaction. A panel of experts then reviewed these questionnaires, and their feedback resulted in a revision that was submitted to a second panel for further critiquing.

After a second revision, the questionnaires were sent to all participants, approximately 200 people, for anonymous response. The five separate questionnaires were color coded according to the target population intended for the survey—consulting teacher/mentor, mentee/newly hired teacher, DRB member, field administrator, and central office administrator. The questionnaires were sent with a cover letter encouraging their completion and anonymous return to the district administrator. As the completed questionnaires came in, the district administrator had them bundled for delivery to the evaluators. Approximately one-half of the questionnaires were returned.

While the responses were being entered into a database, the evaluators reviewed and reconfirmed with the initiating district administrator, that the questionnaires were providing the type of feedback they had hoped for. The quantitative responses were analyzed through descriptive statistics, correlations, and analyses of variance. The qualitative (open-ended)

responses were analyzed by initial coding, focused coding, categorization, and having at least two, sometimes three, experts in the content area interpret the results.

The combination of these two approaches is sometimes referred to as mixed methods (Newman & Benz, 1998; Newman, Ridenour, Newman, & DiMarco, in press). The mixed methods approach, which was applied in this research, generally starts off with a qualitative inquiry that leads to a quantitative assessment, and sometimes returns to a qualitative interpretation. It is highly heuristic in nature. In this study we started with the qualitative question, "What should be evaluated?" which was followed by a quantitative assessment of the responses to the questionnaires. These results along with the analysis of the open-ended questions resulted in a qualitative-quantitative analysis of the mentoring-evaluation program.

In keeping with the Personnel Involvement Evaluation Model, the evaluators engaged the district administrator to help them interpret the meaning of and to look for "patterns and surprises" (Landwehr & Watkins, 1986, preface) in the raw data as it was displayed in frequency counts, means, and correlation tables. This allowed the administrator to become more reflective about the questions he was interested in and these questions became more focused than the previously asked questions. After identifying the statistically significant items in the data analyses, the administrator identified 23 specific questions that were to be explored in more detail. These questions are provided below along with the responses made by the evaluators.

The recursive nature of this process, that is, looking at the outcome of the analyses and noting the patterns of expected and unexpected results, allowed the administrator and the evaluators to become more reflective. This is similar to Patton's (1990) concept of theoretical sampling. The administrator had so much information—approximately 100 pages of printouts—that he could not necessarily answer the original questions. His knowledge of the participants,

however, allowed him to see beyond the data, inferring depth and meaning from it, and allowed the evaluators to understand the meaning of the data in ways that could not have existed without his participation and that of other members of the focus group.

Data Sources

The data sources were the participants separated by roles: interns (newly hired teachers), consulting teachers (mentors), and administrators/managers (building administration, central office administrations, and members of the board managing the program).

Findings

In analyzing the data, the three management groups (field administrators, central officer administrators, and members of the DRB) were grouped together because their numbers were so few separately that any analytical results would be too highly questionable.

The direct responses to the 23 specific questions poised during the review of the raw data are provided in summary form here, that is, the statistics, charts, and all but one table upon which they are based are not provided herein. The extended responses and underlying statistics, charts, and tables can be obtained from the lead author who may be contacted at ltrenta@uakron.edu.

1. Which professional development area was most needed? The consulting teachers rated the professional development needs of interns more strongly in all four areas—planning, delivery, discipline and management, and instructional evaluation—than did the interns and the administrators. However, the only difference in opinion that was statistically significant was that between the consulting teachers and the administrators concerning the need for professional development with regard to discipline and management. The consulting teachers rated the interns' need in this area significantly stronger than did the administrators.

2. Which [professional development] need most needs to be met? In general, when asked to rate how well professional development needs were met, the interns gave the highest ratings and the administrators gave the lowest ratings in all areas. There were statistically significant differences between the interns and the administrators in the ratings of the interns' professional development needs being met in Planning and Delivery with the interns giving significantly higher ratings in both areas. According to the interns and the administrators the professional development need that most needs to be met is Planning while the consulting teachers cited Delivery
3. Are consulting teachers regarded as exemplary teachers? There are no statistically significant differences between the groups in their responses. All three groups regarded the consulting teachers as exemplary teachers
4. Were there any differences between respondent groups in the rankings of instructional components? The interns ranked feedback on Planning significantly lower in importance than did the consulting teachers and the administrators. The

Table 4b: Rankings of Importance of Feedback for Instructional Components

	CTs	Interns	Admin.
Most Important	Planning▪	Discipline & Management◊	Planning▪
	Discipline & Management◊	Delivery	Delivery
	Delivery	Planning▪	Discipline & Management◊
Least Important	Instructional Evaluation	Instructional Evaluation	Instructional Evaluation

▪ Significant difference between interns and both consulting teachers and administrators.
◊ Significant difference between administrators and both consulting teachers and interns.

administrators ranked feedback on Discipline and Management significantly lower than did the interns and the consulting teachers.

5. Do the consulting teachers and interns differ in their responses to sufficiency and appropriateness of teaching function issues? The interns were significantly less certain of what is expected of them in the Teacher Evaluation Program (TEP) than were the consulting teachers and the administrators of their roles. There were also significant differences in the perceptions about the sufficiency of time in that the consulting teachers expressed a significantly stronger disapproval of the statement that there is too much time provided for mentoring than do the interns. The administrators agreed with the consulting teachers and significantly differed with the interns about the amount of time.

In the examination of issues related to time there are the next four questions to consider:

6. Did the interns feel there was enough time for the consulting teachers to observe and conference? The consulting teachers did not judge their released time for observing and conferencing as sufficient. In this they differed with both the interns and the administrators to a statistically significant degree.
7. Do the interns feel they have enough time to meet the requirements of the TEP?
8. Do the consulting teachers feel they have enough time to meet the requirements of the TEP?
9. Do the building administrators feel they have enough time to meet the requirements of the TEP?

The consulting teachers, interns, and administrators did judge the time devoted to the TEP as sufficient. At the same time, all three groups also agreed, without

significant difference, that the TEP required a greater time commitment than they had thought it would.

In terms of the time provided for mentoring, all disagreed with the statement that too much time was provided, and the interns and administrators agreed with the statement that not enough time was provided. The responses of the interns was significantly more negative than those of both the consulting teachers and the administrators both as to too much time being provided and the need for more time for mentoring.

10. How well did the consulting teachers meet the needs of their interns? Are any areas unique? The answer appears to be "quite well." All three groups agree with that. Although the ratings of the administrators are lower than that of the interns and consulting teachers in five instances, they are still on the positive side in every instance. Dealing with judgments about the quality of the feedback, there are no significant differences between the judgments of the three groups in this area. Overall the feedback between consulting teachers and interns is judged to be excellent for the most part, and it meets the needs of the interns at least 80% of the time.
11. Is there a correlation between the size of the experience difference between the interns and the consulting teachers and their ability to positively interact with each other? The anonymity of the questionnaires prevented making this comparison.
12. Entering into the specific area of Program Design Issues, the first question is How effective is the information provided to interns regarding the TEP? The consulting teachers gave the highest ratings of the three groups to the four survey statements

related to the TEP program design. From their perspective, from strongest to weakest ratings, they understand what is expected of them, find the handbook helpful, believe the process is clearly explained, and receive information on how to prepare for the TEP. The administrators' ratings track those of the consulting teachers but at non-significantly lower levels. The interns also gave positive ratings to the four items, but all their responses were significantly lower than those both of the consulting teachers and of the administrators. Their highest rating was for understanding what was expected of them, followed by the process being clearly explained and the TEP Evaluation Handbook as helpful. Their lowest rating went to clear information being given on how to prepare for the TEP. Insofar as the interns are concerned the information provided to them is effective, but they rate it at a significantly lower level of confidence than either the consulting teachers or the administrators.

13. Does the feedback provided to the interns meet their needs? The interns rated the feedback they received as excellent 78.89% of the time and inadequate only 14.87% of the time. All groups agreed that the feedback to interns was sufficient to meet their needs.
14. Does the feedback provided to the consulting teachers by the District Review Board (DRB) meet their needs? The consulting teachers rated the feedback from the DRB as excellent 43.1% of the time and inadequate 25.5% of the time. Across the board the DRB feedback provided to the consulting teachers was judged "excellent" less often and "inadequate" more often than any other feedback.
15. Do the consulting teachers and the administrators agree in their opinions of the interns? The consulting teachers judged that their perceptions agreed with those of

the administrators 88.49% of the time while the administrators said their perception of the interns agreed with that of the consulting teachers 83.1% of the time. The difference between the two groups was not significant.

16. How comfortable are all groups in the combined mentor-evaluator role that consulting teachers are fulfilling? The differences in the responses of the three groups were not statistically significant. They are more than slightly comfortable with the consulting teachers roles as mentor, evaluator, and in the combined role. While the difference is not significant, it is interesting to note that it was the administrators who expressed the least comfort in the consulting teachers in each of the roles and the consulting teachers who expressed the greatest comfort. All three groups also express the greatest comfort with the consulting teachers in the role of mentor, followed by the combination of roles with the least level of comfort expressed for the consulting teachers in the role of evaluator.
17. How satisfied were the interns regarding the professional development activities provided for them? The interns expressed slight to moderate satisfaction with the professional development opportunities afforded to them.
18. How satisfied were the consulting teachers regarding the professional development activities provided for them? Consulting teachers more than slightly agree that their professional development opportunities have been sufficient and appropriate. Yet, they do believe that they would benefit from training other than Pathwise training and that they need additional training to be more effective with new teachers. Of the possibilities explicitly addressed, the weakest positive agreements for this aspect came in response to statements that the coaching training skills was sufficient, that

the consulting teachers share strategies, and that the Pathwise training was sufficient. The interns gave a significantly lower, yet still positive, response to the statement that there is a need for additional training for consulting teachers to work effectively with new teachers. Administrators rated the statement comparably to the consulting teachers.

Moving to the six general questions that led off the list of questions from the administration, we have these questions.

19. Were there significant differences of perceptions among surveyed groups? Yes, there were. However, the significant differences were in the strength of the mean responses to particular questions or statements and not different in the sense of being opposite responses except in one case. In that one case the interns slightly disagreed with the statement that there was not enough time provided for mentoring while the consulting teachers and administrators agreed with the statement. Other than that one situation, the differences were between slight agreement and moderate to strong agreement with the statements rather then one group agreeing and another group disagreeing.
20. Were there significant differences within groups by assignment, number of years of experience, or teaching level? Among the interns, there were no significant correlations based on years of experience. There were a number of significant correlations between the teaching level of the intern and the responses to some of the questions/statements. In general, the significant correlations with the elementary level were positive and those with the middle and high school levels were negative (that is, the responses tended to be lower than the responses given by those not in the

that group). From the middle and high school level responses that had a significant correlation, one might generalize that the interns in those levels were more likely than the elementary interns to perceived that consulting teachers needed to collaborate more and receive more training for working with new teachers. However, it must be emphasized again, that the actual responses from these groups tended to be positive or supportive of the program as it was put into operation. The middle and high school level interns simply were not as positive in their expressed perceptions as were the elementary level interns.

Among the consulting teachers, there were no significant correlations based on years of experience. There were several significant correlations between the teaching level of the consulting teacher and the responses to some of the questions/statements. Among the consulting teachers, most of the statistically significant correlations between level and responses to questionnaire prompts dealt with feedback, either that received by the consulting teachers or their perceptions of the importance of feedback related to one of the four teaching functions identified in the TEP. The one correlation that did not relate to feedback was that the elementary level consulting teachers had a negative correlation with the statement that the CTs share strategies to facilitate interns. Between the middle and high school level interns and the elementary level consulting teachers, each of the three levels had a group giving lower rating to the success of the consulting teachers' sharing of strategies.

21. What information do we have regarding the mentoring-evaluating issue in our present format? and
22. If there were not differences, then the similarities of perceptions should be noted.

Probably the most telling data related to these questions were the responses of the three groups about their comfort with the consulting teachers role as evaluator and the combined role of mentor and evaluator. All groups expressed slight to moderate comfort with the roles. The consulting teachers gave the highest rating and the administrators the lowest with the interns in-between. None signaled discomfort with the roles and the comfort level was well above the lowest comfort level for all three groups. All groups were basically comfortable with the combined roles.

23. How do the comments support the survey responses? The responses to the open-ended questions provided support for the survey findings and some hints on ways to improve the mentoring-evaluating situation. The recommendations for improving the mentoring and evaluating components of the program can be summed up as more time, more specifically scheduled time for all stakeholders, more opportunities to interact, less paperwork, greater flexibility in dealing with newly hired teachers who are experienced and have demonstrated their competence elsewhere.

Results and Conclusions

The results from all stakeholders supported the mentor-evaluation program. Some stakeholders were more positive about some aspects of the programs than others, but everyone believed the program worked. At the same time the perceptions of almost all aspects of the program indicated room for improvement. Whether the scale was Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, Comfortable to Uncomfortable, Sufficient or Appropriate to Insufficient or Inappropriate, or Met or Unmet (professional development needs), the mean responses rarely were close to the strongest or most positive response. The identification of differences between

groups led to interesting discussions between the stakeholders and a better understanding of the difference in perceptions.

One interesting result was the comfort levels of all stakeholders in having the mentors serve in dual roles, as a mentor and as an evaluator of his or her intern (new teacher). Mentors' successfully serving as evaluators is contrary to most of the current research about mentoring. In this case of added note is that it was the administrators who were least comfortable with consulting teachers being both mentors and evaluators, although their comfort level was not significantly different than either the interns or the consulting teachers.

Another issue that became evident was the lack of flexibility caused by requiring the application of the TEP process to all new teachers in the same way, that is, by not allowing for difference in treatment between a newly hired teacher who is a first year teacher and a newly hired teacher who was a successful, experienced teacher in another district.

Two anticipated results were that time is an issue, as is the amount of record keeping. There were three interrelated issues raised about time: (a) the need to prioritize time for the mentoring process, (b) the need to provide more time for the consulting teachers to devote to the program, and (c) the need for consulting teachers and administrators to prioritize time to deal with the evaluation requirements.

The record keeping paperwork was considered too time consuming and not relevant to improving performance.

Use of Evaluation Results

Again, in line with the Personnel Involvement Evaluation Model, the final report prepared by the evaluators was delivered to and discussed with the district administrator. The executive summary, which included detailed responses to the 24 specific questions as well as the

original five focusing questions, was provided to the DRB. The lead evaluators met with the DRB and discussed the findings and recommendations with them. The members recognized the overall positive nature of the responses from all participant groups. They also noted that the changes for improvement of the program illuminated by the results of the evaluation were subtle rather than substantial. The DRB intended to use the executive summary both to stimulate conversations with the larger stakeholder group and to report the state of the TEP program to their board of education.

Limitations of the Evaluation

The most significant limitation was that the evaluation of program effectiveness was tied to the perceptions of the stakeholders rather than to measures of behavior, due to a short time frame for the evaluation and limited funds. The effort to overcome this limitation included aggregating the scores (rankings and ratings) and providing for reliability and validity checks using a focus group, expert judges, and piloting the instruments.

Another limitation is the probable presence of aspects of the Hawthorne Effect. That is, some participants can be expected to respond to the surveys in what they perceived to be the socially desirable manner rather than expressing their own judgments. On the other hand, people who have hostile feelings toward the district or the district management can be expected to respond in ways that would be perceived as denigrating the program. They express their anger rather than their judgment. The same efforts used to overcome the use of stakeholder perceptions rather than hard measures of behavior are useful in overcoming the desire to give the socially acceptable response and the desire to express anger or inflict harm rather than to express considered judgment.

To give fullest assurance of anonymity, the survey forms did not have a place for name or signature and the forms and return envelopes were not coded in any way. This meant that it was not possible to directly encourage those who did not return the survey to fill it out. Also, it was not possible to solicit opinions from those who did not return the survey by another means, such as a telephone survey. As a result, the evaluation is based on the perceptions of those who chose to respond to the survey and does not consider the opinions of those who chose not to respond.

Due to the small number of administrators in the district, in analyzing the data it was necessary to combine the administrator groups (central office and building) in order to have a sufficient number for the statistical analysis to have a reasonable degree of certainty.

Significance

There is educational significance to this study on two levels. First, it is an example, a case study, of using a highly participatory process for the formative evaluation of a teacher induction program. The education of the evaluators concerning the program enabled them to more effectively meet the needs of the stakeholders/client. The step-by-step interaction between the evaluators and the client administrator and the stakeholder focus group enabled stakeholders' questions about the program to become more targeted and more insightful. Mixing qualitative data collection and analysis with quantitative methods both longitudinally in the course of the evaluation and latitudinally in the questionnaires provided a final product that was highly meaningful and useful to the stakeholders. Particularly encouraging was that the meanings or concepts held by individuals appeared to broaden as the stakeholders listened to and embraced the meanings of others in the course of this evaluative process.

Second, the finding that all groups were comfortable with the mentor also being a participant in the evaluation of the interns contradicts the conventional wisdom that the roles

should be separated. Particularly interesting is that the two groups expressing the highest level of comfort with the mentor-evaluator combined role were those most intimately involved in it, the interns and the consulting teachers.

References

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Bridges, E. M. & Groves, B. R. (1999, November). The macro- and micropolitics of personnel evaluation: A framework. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13*(4), 321-337.

Caracelli, V. J. (2000, Winter). Evaluation use at the threshold of the Twenty-First Century. *New Direction for Evaluation No. 88,* pp.99-111.

Dagenais, R. J. (1996). *Mentoring program standards.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED419776.)

Davis, D. R., Pool, J. E., & Mits-Cash, M. (2000, December). Issues in implementing a new teacher assessment system in a large urban school district: Results of a qualitative field study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 14*(4), 285-306.

Heiffetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to assess systems for evaluating educators.* (Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Landwehr, J.M., & Watkins, A. E. (1986). *Exploring data.* Palo Alto, CA: Dale Seymour Publications.

Newman I. & Benz, C. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Newman, I. & Deitchman, R., & Williams, J. (1978, August). An Evaluation Model Emphasizing Personnel Involvement: A Motivational and Learning Approach. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED166603)

Newman, I. Ridenour, C., Newman, C., & DiMarco, G. (in press). A typology of research purposes and its relationship to mixed methods. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Preskill, H. & Torres, R. T. (2000, Winter). The learning dimension of evaluation use. *New Direction for Evaluation No. 88,* pp. 25-37.

Stronge, J. H. & Tucker, P. D. (1999, November). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 13*(4), 339-359.

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (Eds.) (1994). *Handbook of practical program evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)